



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,778	02/15/2001	Tsui-Tuan Fan Wong	CFP-11803	3037

7590 12/17/2001

Alan Kamrath
RIDER BENNETT EGAN & ARUNDEL, LLP
Suite 2000
333 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

FIGUEROA, FELIX O

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,778

Applicant(s)

FAN WONG, TSUI-TUAN

Examiner

Felix O. Figueroa

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2001 and 09 October 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (US 4,812,956) in view of Shen (US 5,964,518) and Kopenhaver (US 3,775,828).

Chen discloses a connector for a decorative light comprising a first adapter with a female connector (inside 52) having two holes, and a resilient first cover (52) formed outside the joint between the connector and a first end of the enclosure (1), a second adapter having a male connector (inside 51) provided with two prongs, and a second cover (51) formed on the joint between the connector and a second end of the enclosure (1), and a collar. However, Chen does not specifically disclose the pins on the connectors. Shen teaches a male-female connector (22) having first pins (221) electrically connected to holes (222); and a male connector (23) having second pins (231) electrically connected to extended prongs (231), the prongs selectively receivable in the two plated holes (222) to facilitate the connection between the connectors and their respective enclosure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a male-female connector having first pins electrically connected to plated holes and a male connector having second pins electrically connected to extended prongs, as taught by Shen, to

Art Unit: 2833

facilitate the connection between the connectors and their respective enclosure. Chen does not disclose the collar having an inner thread. Kopenhaver teaches a collar (16) having an inner thread (60) formed to correspond to an outer thread (44) of a second cover (50) to securely connect the collar to the second cover. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a collar having an inner thread, as taught by Kopenhaver, to securely connect the collar to the second cover.

Regarding claim 2, Chen, as modified by Shen, discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the axial depth of the outer thread of the second cover. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the depth of the outer thread of the second cover a half of the axial depth of the inner thread of the collar, since applicant has not disclosed that such arrangement solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Kopenhaver shows a flange (68) on the outer periphery of the first cover to hold the collar with the first adapter when the adapter is connected to the mating adapter. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a flange, as taught by Kopenhaver, to hold the collar with the adapter when the adapter is connected to the mating part.

Regarding claims 5-12, Chen shows a plug (56), having a blind hole, detachably connected to one of the adapters. Chen does not specifically disclose the plug having an outer thread. However, Chen discloses the connection between the second adapter

and the controlling unit using an outer thread. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a similar connection system between the plug and the first adapter.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/19/01 and 10/09/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's arguments that Chen does not included the two plated holes, please note that Shen discloses the limitations toward the male-female connector.

Regarding applicant's arguments on Shen, please note that the argued limitations are disclosed by Chen. Applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Additionally, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).


Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix O. Figueroa whose telephone number is (703) 308-0097. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:00.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.


Gary Paumen
Primary Examiner

ffr
December 12, 2001